

REMARKS

The Invention

The present invention relates to wheelbarrows and, more particularly, to wheelbarrows which can be collapsed or folded for shipping and storage.

Status of the Claims

Claims 23-25, 27-34 and 36-50 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-22, 26 and 35 are cancelled.

Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, 36, 38-42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Edhardt*, U.S. Patent No. 2,660,446.

Claims 24, 43-45 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt*, '446, in view of *Leger et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,908,202.

Claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* '446 in view of *Donze et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,026,079.

Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* '446 in view of *Aielli*, U.S. Patent No. 6,186,523.

Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, 36, 38-42, 46 and 47; Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, 36, 38-42, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Edhardt*, U.S. Patent No. 2,660,446. *Edhardt* discloses a folding wheelbarrow having a frame assembly and removable basket. The assembly includes a rigid forward assembly structured to rotatably support a wheel. The forward assembly further includes a pair of bearings (not shown). *See*, Col. 1, line 30. The frame assembly also includes a pair of mirror image handlebars (11) which bend into inclined shafts (7) and then into support/feet (9/10). The inclined shaft passes through the bearing and is rotatable therein. Col. 1, lines 26-34. The bearings include a clamp (8) structured to prevent the inclined shaft from rotating. *Id.* The Examiner asserts that such a clamp corresponds to a "clamping device extending between the first and second handle arms and removably applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a

lateral direction and clamp the tray between the first and second handle arms” as recited in Claims 22 and 31. Applicants disagree.

First, the *Edhardt* clamping means is described as merely a “bolt and a winged nut” and is shown “diagrammatically.” Col. 1, line 34. As shown, the clamping device is coupled to a side plate 4 and does not appear to connect to the handle members (11) or the inclined shafts (7). Given these facts, Applicants assert that the lack of detail in the *Edhardt* clamping means render the reference non-operable. That is, as set forth in MPEP § 2121.01, “The disclosure in an assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter; mere naming or description of the subject matter is insufficient, if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation.” *Id.*, citing *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research*, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Here the reference merely states that there is a clamping device that has a “bolt and a winged nut.” The clamping device is shown “diagrammatically” in one out of three figures, and that view is merely a side view of a winged nut located somewhere near the inclined shaft. Moreover, the “bearing” that the clamping device works upon is not shown at all. As such, one skilled in the art could not reproduce such a clamping device without undue experimentation. Accordingly, the *Edhardt* reference is not an enabling reference and cannot be used as the basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Further, the *Edhardt* clamping means is described as limiting the rotation of the inclined shaft within the bearing. “Limiting rotation” indicates that the clamping device causes the bearing to tighten on the inclined shaft. By limiting rotation, the handles/inclined shafts are maintained in a selected orientation. Maintaining an element in a selected orientation is different than “applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction” as recited in Claims 22 and 31. That is, if the *Edhardt* clamping means holds the handles in a fixed orientation by limiting the rotation, the handles cannot exert a lateral clamping force. This conclusion is further supported by the specification which fails to describe a lateral force on the basket, but does state that the basket is carried by the supports (9). Col. 1, lines 35-36. That is, the supports (9) hold the basket, and not the handles (11).

Also, given the lack of detail in the *Edhardt* disclosure and Figures, there is no indication that the *Edhardt* clamping means extends “between the first and second handle arms” as recited in Claims 23 and 31. That is, a clamping means having a bolt and a winged nut wherein the bolt extended from the first and second handle arms would merely draw the arms together when the winged nut was tightened. Such a device would not “prevent the inclined shaft from rotating” as described in the *Edhardt* specification. As such, there is at least an implication that the *Edhardt* clamping means acts on an individual bearing and does not extend between the first and second handle arms. Moreover, as noted above, the *Edhardt* clamping means is shown as being connected to the side plates (4) and not to the handles/inclined shafts (11/7).

Further, the *Edhardt* reference discloses that the basket is merely supported by the supports (9) as opposed to being “removably secured” thereto. As set forth in the attached definitions, the word “secured” means “positioned or fixed firmly,” “to make fast <secure a door> <secure a bike to a tree>,” or, “firmly fastened.” Cambridge Online Dictionary, at <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=71111&dict=CALD>; Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, at <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>; American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, at <http://www.bartleby.com/61/97/S0209700.html> (attached hereto as Exhibits A, B, and C). These definitions conform to the use of the word “secure” in the present application which discloses outwardly extending lateral tabs being inserted into slots and having a lateral clamping force applied thereto. The *Edhardt* reference, however, merely discloses a basket sitting on supports. The basket is not coupled to the supports, or the handle members, by any type of coupling device. As such, it cannot reasonably be said that the *Edhardt* reference discloses a tray/basket that is “removably secured” to the handle arm as recited in Claim 31 of the present application.

Similarly, the *Edhardt* reference fails to disclose that the front bracket has a laterally extending front section. That is, the *Edhardt* bracket is a U-shaped bracket that has two side plates (4) and a top plate (6) and extends over the wheel. In this configuration, the front side of the bracket is open. As set forth in Claims 30 and 38 of the present application, the front bracket is U-shaped and has a laterally extending front section and two rearwardly extending legs. Simply put, the brackets have a different

orientation and, as the orientation of the bracket is recited in the claims, the present claims do not read upon the *Edhardt* reference.

As stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.... The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.

Verdigaal Brothers v. Union Oil Company of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Company*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989). It is respectfully submitted that upon reading the *Edhardt* reference one skilled in the art would not consider a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction.

Independent Claim 23 recites a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction. As this reference fails to disclose a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction, this reference cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of Claim 23 should be withdrawn.

Claim 25, which depends from Claim 23, further recites that the clamping device includes a rigid rod extending between the first and second handle arms. As this reference fails to disclose a clamping device that includes a rigid rod extending between the first and second handle arms, this reference cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of Claim 25 should be withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 28 each depend from Claim 23 and rely upon their dependency for patentability.

Claim 30, which depends from Claim 23, further recites that the front bracket is generally U-shaped and has a laterally extending front section. As this reference fails to disclose a front bracket that is generally U-shaped and has a laterally extending front

section, this reference cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of Claim 30 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 31 recites a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction and a tray removably secured to the first and second handle arms. As this reference fails to disclose a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction and a tray removably secured to the first and second handle arms, this reference cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of Claim 31 should be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 36 each depend from Claim 31 and rely upon their dependency for patentability.

Claim 38, which depends from Claim 31, further recites that the front bracket is generally U-shaped and has a laterally extending front section. As this reference fails to disclose a front bracket that is generally U-shaped and has a laterally extending front section, this reference cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and the rejection of Claim 38 should be withdrawn.

Claims 39, 41 and 42 each depend from Claim 23 and rely upon their dependency for patentability.

Claims 40, 46, and 47 each depend from Claim 31 and rely upon their dependency for patentability.

Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, 36, 38-42, 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Edhardt* should be withdrawn.

Claims 24, 43-45 and 48-50; Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 24, 43-45 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt*, '446, in view of *Leger et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,908,202. The deficiencies of *Edhardt* as a reference are discussed above. *Leger* discloses a collapsible wheelbarrow having a flexible container or tray. That is, the container is made from a fabric and is supported by a plurality of tension members. The tension members are

inelastic. (Col. 9, lines 24-28). The *Leger* wheelbarrow also has a folding frame assembly having separate handle members and leg members. The frame assembly further includes a latching assembly (Col. 9, line 28 - Col. 10, line 41) between the handle members having links that move between a first, folded position and a second, over-toggle position. In this configuration, the tension members merely support the container. That is, the tension members have a fixed length and do not apply a clamping force on the handles. The force that holds the wheelbarrow in the expanded configuration is created by a latching assembly that separates the handles while the fabric of the container provides a reactionary force. As set forth at Col. 10, lines 20-41, the elasticity of the fabric creates the reactionary force. The inelastic tension members do not play a part in the latching mechanism. That is, any clamping/reactionary force is created by the latching device and the fabric container and not by the tension members. The tension members merely support the upper edges and the front side of the fabric container.

Thus, as described above, *Edhardt* discloses a frame assembly having a clamping means structured to limit the rotation of the inclined shaft within the bearing. *Leger*, on the other hand, discloses a latching assembly that cooperates with a fabric container to create a separating force and a reactionary force. Because these two types of forces, anti-rotational and separating/reactionary force, are different, the combination proposed by the Examiner would require the substantial modification of the operating principle of at least one of the references. However, as set forth in MPEP § 2143.01 VI, “[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious.” *Id.*, citing *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

Further, as noted at MPEP § 2143.01 V, “[i]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.” *Id.*, citing *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Here, the *Leger* device relies upon a constant tension, created by the fabric container, to maintain the latch device in an over-toggle position. The *Edhardt* clamping means is structured to limit the rotation of the frame assembly. That is, the *Edhardt* clamping means locks the frame assembly in a

set orientation. If the frame is set in a specific orientation, there is no tension between the frame assembly and the container/basket. Similarly, as described above, the *Edhardt* basket merely rests upon the frame assembly support members. Conversely, the *Leger* fabric container is directly coupled to the frame assembly so as to provide the required reactionary force. If the free standing basket of *Edhardt* was incorporated into the *Leger* frame assembly, the basket would not provide the required reactionary force.

Accordingly, for these reasons, the combination proposed by the Examiner is not appropriate and the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 24, which depends from Claim 23, recites a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction, wherein the clamping device includes a flexible cable. As these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner and because the individual references fail to suggest a wheelbarrow having a clamping device applying a laterally-extending clamping force between the first and second handle arms to move the first and second handle arms relative to one another in a lateral direction, wherein the clamping device includes a flexible cable, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 24 should be withdrawn.

Claim 43, which depends from Claim 23, recites that the clamping device includes a tension member having an adjustable length. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose or suggest a flexible cable and as *Leger* states that the tension members are inelastic, neither cited reference discloses a tension member having an adjustable length. Moreover, as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 43 should be withdrawn.

Claim 44 depends from Claim 43 and relies upon its dependency for patentability.

Claim 45, which depends from Claim 43, recites that the clamping device includes a handle that increase/decreases the effective length of the tension member. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose or suggest a flexible cable and as *Leger* states that the tension members are inelastic, neither cited reference discloses that the clamping device includes a handle that increases/decreases the effective length of the

tension member. Moreover, as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 45 should be withdrawn.

Claim 48, which depends from Claim 31, recites that the clamping device includes a tension member having an adjustable length. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose or suggest a flexible cable and as *Leger* states that the tension members are inelastic, neither cited reference discloses a tension member having an adjustable length. Moreover, as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 48 should be withdrawn.

Claim 49 depends from Claim 48 and relies upon its dependency for patentability.

Claim 50, which depends from Claim 48, recites that the clamping device includes a handle that increases/decreases the effective length of the tension member. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose or suggest a flexible cable and as *Leger* states that the tension members are inelastic, neither cited reference discloses that the clamping device includes a handle that increases/decreases the effective length of the tension member. Moreover, as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 50 should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 24, 43-45 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* in view of *Leger* should be withdrawn.

Claims 29 and 37; Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* '446 in view of *Donze et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,026,079. The deficiencies of *Edhardt* as a reference are discussed above. *Donze* discloses a non-collapsible wheelbarrow having adjustable handles. As set forth at Col. 4, lines 1-11, the *Donze* wheelbarrow handle members are adjustable to a variety of positions for use "depending upon the stature of the user so as to avoid an uncomfortable working position." These positions, however, are all "working positions." That is, the wheelbarrow of the present application, is structured to be converted between a working configuration and a storage

configuration. In the storage configuration, the upper arms are moved into a retracted position. As used in the specification, a “retracted position” is not a “working position” as set forth in *Donze*.

Moreover, the Examiner has not demonstrated where these references suggest such a combination. As stated in, *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 2 USPQ2d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 1987), “obviousness cannot be established by combining teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, *absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting combination*” (*emphasis added*). Put another way, “the mere fact that disclosures or teachings of the prior art can be retrospectively combined for the purpose of evaluating obviousness/nonobviousness issue does not make the combination set forth in the invention obvious, *unless the art also suggested the desirability of the combination ...*” *Rite-Hite Corp. v Kelly Co.*, 629 F.Supp. 1042, 231 USPQ 161, *aff’d* 819 F.2d 1120, 2 USPQ2d 1915 (E.D. Wis. 1986) (*emphasis added*). Similarly, the court in, *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991), stated that “both the suggestion [to make the claimed apparatus] and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not in the Applicants’ disclosure.” Here, there is no suggestion that the cited references should be combined. As such, the combination of these references would not be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claim 29, which depends from Claim 23, recites that the handle arms include an upper arm and a lower arm and that the upper arm may be moved into a retracted position. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose telescoping arms and as *Donze* fails to disclose a handle having a retracted position, and as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 29 should be withdrawn.

Claim 37, which depends from Claim 31, recites that the handle arms include an upper arm and a lower arm and that the upper arm may be moved into a retracted position. As the Examiner states that *Edhardt* fails to disclose telescoping arms and as *Donze* fails to disclose a handle having a retracted position, and as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to

support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claim 37 should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the rejections of Claims 29 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* in view of *Donze* should be withdrawn.

Claims 33 and 34; Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Edhardt* '446 in view of *Aielli*, U.S. Patent No. 6,186,523. The deficiencies of *Edhardt* as a reference are discussed above. *Aielli* discloses a dolly having pivoting arms and an attachable container. The container includes “two spring pin brackets.” A spring pin bracket, typically, includes two side plates and a base forming a U-shape, a pin having a spring flange and a spring disposed about the pin and between a side plate and the spring flange. *See e.g.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,087,977, Figure 7, Reference # 74. Such a mechanical device is substantially different than either a “tab” (Claim 33) or a “rail” (Claim 34).

Moreover, similar to the description of the clamping device in *Edhardt*, the description of the spring pin bracket of *Aielli* is non-enabling. That is, based on the description and the figures provided, it is not clear how two spring pin brackets stay coupled to the pivoting handles. Spring pin brackets, typically, are used to couple two elements in a generally fixed relationship. If one of the members is movable, the movable member may be simply pulled away from the pin. Thus, in *Aielli*, it is unclear how a spring pin bracket may be coupled to the movable handle in a manner that would link the container to the handles. Again, as set forth in MPEP § 2121.01, “The disclosure in an assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter; mere naming or description of the subject matter is insufficient, if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation.” *Id.*, citing *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research*, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Here, the reference merely states that there are two spring pin brackets and that they are coupled to the handles. Figure 3 is the only relevant figure with regard to the spring pin brackets and it merely shows a vertical extension with an opening without a pin. As such, one skilled in the art could not reproduce such a spring pin

bracket structured to couple a container to a handle without undue experimentation. Accordingly, the *Aielli* reference is not an enabling reference and cannot be used as the basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Further, *Aielli* discloses that the tabs extend in a vertical direction. The direction of the tabs or rails extends is functional. That is, given that the handles pivot generally laterally, the tabs or rails must also extend laterally to engage the handles in a secure relationship. The extensions in *Aielli* must be disposed in the vertical orientation so that the spring pins extend horizontally so as to engage the openings (28). That is, if the extensions in *Aielli* extended horizontally, the spring pins would be disposed adjacent to the solid top surface of the handles. Such a configuration would render the *Aielli* spring pins inoperable. As such, the vertical extension disclosed in *Aielli* do not teach or suggest the lateral tabs as recited in Claims 33 and 34 of the present application.

Further, neither *Edhardt* nor *Aielli* teach, suggest, or provide an incentive supporting combination thereof. As set forth above, such a teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting combination is required in order to properly combine two or more references. Here the Examiner has merely identified two references having similar elements to those claimed in the present application. However, as set forth in MPEP § 2143.01 III, “[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.” *Id.* citing *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Accordingly, for these reasons, the combination proposed by the Examiner is not appropriate and the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. That is, Claims 33 and 34 each recite a tray having lateral coupling elements, either tabs or rails. As the Examiner has stated that *Edhardt* fails to disclose lateral elements extending from the tray and as *Aielli* also fails to disclose lateral elements, and as these references cannot be combined as suggested by the Examiner, these references cannot be used to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection of Claims 33 and 34 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in proper form for issuance of a Notice of Allowance and such action is requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. C. Jenkins', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David C. Jenkins
Registration No. 42,691
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
600 Grant Street, 44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 566-1253
Attorney for Applicants

Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary



Buy me!

Look it up

We publish dictionaries for people learning English all over the world

Choose the right dictionary for you...

Resources

Activities
Top 40 words
Word of the day
Data for
Language
Researchers
About the corpus

English Language Teaching from Cambridge University Press

Many more resources are available from Cambridge ELT.

Definition

< - Back to results

secure (FIXED) [Show phonetics](#)
adjective

1 positioned or fixed firmly and correctly and therefore not likely to move, fall or break:

That ladder doesn't look very secure to me.

Check that all windows and doors are secure.

FIGURATIVE *Her promotion has made her position in the company more secure.*

FIGURATIVE *The museum has been promised £22 million by the government, so its future is relatively secure.*

2 A secure place is one that it is difficult

EXHIBIT "A"



Search

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

to get out of or escape from:

He killed the man just a month after his release from a secure mental hospital.

secure [Show phonetics](#)

verb [T]

to fasten one object firmly to another:

*The gate won't stay open, so we'll have to secure it **to** that post.*

securely [Show phonetics](#)

adverb

positioned or fastened firmly and correctly and therefore not likely to move, fall or break:

Please ensure that your seat belts are fastened securely.

FIGURATIVE He has given up political power, but he remains securely in control of the army.

security [Show phonetics](#)

noun [U]

when something is not likely to fail or be lost:

*If it's a choice between higher pay and **job** security, I'd prefer to keep my job.*


I'm on a temporary contract and have little financial security (= little certainty of having enough money to live on).

(from [Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary](#))



Want more? Subscribe
to Cambridge

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



SHE MARRIED HIM??!!

AND THEY'VE GOT 7 KIDS??



classmates.com



Also Visit : Unabridged Dictionary · Learner's Dictionary · Word Central for Kids · Collegi

☒ Dictionary
 ☐ Thesaurus
 ☐ Spanish/English

OnLine

Home
Visit Our
Sites
Premium
Services
Downloads
Word of the
Day
Word
Games
Open
Dictionary
Spelling
Bee Hive
Word for
the Wise
Online
Store
Help
About Us

secure

2 entries found for **secure**.

To select an entry, click on it.

 secure[1,adjective]
secure[2,verb]
Main Entry: ²**secure**Function: *verb*Inflected Form(s): **se·cured; se·cur·ing***transitive verb*

1 a : to relieve from exposure to danger : act to make safe against adverse contingencies <*secure* a supply line from enemy raids> **b** : to put beyond hazard of losing or of not receiving : GUARANTEE <*secure* the blessings of liberty -- *U.S.*

Constitution> **c** : to give pledge of payment to (a creditor) or of (an obligation) <*secure* a note by a pledge of collateral>

2 a : to take (a person) into custody : hold fast : PINION **b** : to make fast <*secure* a door> <*secure* a bike to a tree>

3 a : to get secure usually lasting possession or control of <*secure* a job> **b** : BRING ABOUT, EFFECT

EXHIBIT "B"

4 : to release (naval personnel) from work or duty

intransitive verb

1 *of naval personnel* : to stop work : go off duty

2 *of a ship* : to tie up : BERTH

synonym see ENSURE

- **se·cur·er** *noun*


Visit Britannica.com for more information on "secure"

Get the Top 10 Search Results for "secure"

Pronunciation Symbols

[Products](#) [Premium Services](#) [Company Info](#) [Contact Us](#) [Adv](#)

© 2006 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated



Fre
C

S
Phot
Bril
I

[Home](#) | [Subjects](#) | [Titles](#) | [Authors](#) | [Encyclopedia](#) | [Dictionary](#) | [Thesaurus](#) | [Quotations](#) | [English Usage](#)

[Reference](#) > [American Heritage®](#) > [Dictionary](#)

Adv

< [secundines](#) [Securities and Exchange Commission](#) >

[CONTENTS](#) · [INDEX](#) · [ILLUSTRATIONS](#) · [BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD](#)

The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language:
Fourth Edition. 2000.

secure

SYLLABICATION: se·cure

PRONUNCIATION: ˌsɪ-kyoor'

ADJECTIVE: Inflected forms: **se·cur·er**, **se·cur·est**

1. Free from danger or attack: *a secure fortress.*
2. Free from risk of loss; safe: *Her papers were secure in the vault.*
3. Free from the risk of being intercepted or listened to by unauthorized persons: *Only one telephone line in the embassy was secure.*
4. Free from fear, anxiety, or doubt.
- 5a. Not likely to fail or give way; stable: *a secure stepladder.*
- b. Firmly fastened: *a secure lock.*
6. Reliable; dependable: *secure investments.*
7. Assured; certain: *With three goals in the first period they had a secure victory, but somehow they lost.*
8. Archaic Careless or overconfident.

W
1

A
q
f
The
p
*part

EXHIBIT "C"

TRANSITIVE Inflected forms: **se·cured**, **se·cur·ing**,
VERB: **se·cures**

1. To guard from danger or risk of loss: *The troops secured the area before the civilians were allowed to return.* **2.** To make firm or tight; fasten. See synonyms at **fasten**. **3.** To make certain; ensure: *The speaker could not secure the goodwill of the audience.* **4a.** To guarantee payment of (a loan, for example). **b.** To guarantee payment to (a creditor). **5.** To get possession of; acquire: *secured a job.* **6.** To capture or confine: *They secured the suspect in the squad car.* **7.** To bring about; effect: *secured release of the hostages.* **8.** To protect or ensure the privacy or secrecy of (a telephone line, for example).

ETYMOLOGY: Latin *sēcūrus* : *sē-*, without; see **s(w)e-** in Appendix I + *cūra*, care; see cure.

OTHER FORMS: **se·cur'a·ble** —ADJECTIVE
se·cure'ly —ADVERB
se·cure'ment —NOUN
se·cure'ness —NOUN
se·cur'er —NOUN

The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition.
Copyright © 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by the Houghton Mifflin Company. All rights reserved.

[CONTENTS](#) · [INDEX](#) · [ILLUSTRATIONS](#) · [BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD](#)

< [secundines](#) [Securities and Exchange Commission](#) >

Google™

[Click here](#) to shop the [Bartleby Bookstore](#).